

REMARKS

Applicants respectfully request further examination and reconsideration in view of the above amendments. Claims 1, 3-5, and 7-22 are rejected. Claims 7, 10 and 13 are amended herein. New Claims 23-25 have been added. No new matter has been added. Claims 1, 3-5, and 7-25 remain pending in the case.

EXAMINER INTERVIEW SUMMARY

On June 8, 2004, Matthew J. Blecher, Attorney for the Applicants, and Examiner Nguyen participated in a telephonic interview to discuss the rejection of Claims 1, 3-5 and 7-22. Mr. Blecher explained that the Albal reference does not teach or suggest speech patterns for presenting information, as claimed. Moreover, Mr. Blecher explained that any reference Albal makes to speech patterns is used for speech recognition, not information presentation. A detailed explanation follows under the heading "CLAIM REJECTIONS - 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)." Examiner Nguyen agreed that the claimed embodiments recited in Claims 1, 3-5 and 7-22 are not anticipated by the Albal reference, and that the rejection of these claims under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) is overcome. Examiner Nguyen stated that he would undertake another prior art search, and no decision was made as the allowance of Claims 1, 3-5 and 7-22.

CLAIM REJECTIONS - 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)

Claims 1, 3-5 and 7-22 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by United States Patent Application Publication 2003/0147518 by Albal et al., hereinafter referred to as the "Albal" reference. Applicants have reviewed the cited reference and respectfully submit that the embodiments of the present invention as recited in Claims 1, 3-5 and 7-22 are not anticipated by Albal in view of the following rationale.

Applicants respectfully direct the Examiner to independent Claim 1 that recites that an embodiment of the present invention is directed to (emphasis added):

A method of using a telephone identifying information to present information over a telephone interface using a first computer, the method comprising:
 selecting at least one voice character prosody setting of a language based on the telephone identifying information, wherein the voice character prosody setting comprises a speech pattern selected from a set of speech patterns, wherein a speech pattern identifies an intonation for presenting said language; and
 presenting information according to the at least one voice character prosody setting over the telephone interface using the first computer.

Independent Claims 8, 13 and 14 recite similar limitations. Claims 3-5 and 7 that depend from independent Claim 1, Claims 9-12 that depend from independent Claim, and Claims 15-22 that depend from independent Claim 14 provide further limitations descriptive of the features of the present invention.

Albal and the claimed invention are very different. Applicants understand Albal to teach a method and apparatus for delivering caller identification information to a user. In particular, Albal teaches a method and apparatus wherein caller identification information can be presented to a user using different dialog voice personalities (i.e., male/female voice) and grammars. Importantly, Albal is silent as to how a voice personality or grammar is selected for presentation to the user.

For instance, with reference to paragraph 0047 of Albal, a communication node “can provide various dialog voice personalities (i.e., a female voice, a male voice, etc.) and can implement various grammars (i.e., vocabulary) to detect and respond to the audio inputs from the user.” Applicants respectfully assert that a dialog voice personality as taught in Albal does not describe a speech pattern identifying an intonation for presenting the information as claimed. Furthermore, the various grammars as taught in Albal also do not describe a speech pattern identifying an intonation for presenting the information as a vocabulary is a selection of words, and does not include speech patterns as claimed.

Moreover, Albal is silent as to how a particular dialog voice personalities or grammar for presenting information to the user is selected. While Albal

describes different ways for selecting speech recognition models, it is silent as to selecting ways for presenting information to the user (paragraph 0047).

In contrast, embodiments of the claimed invention are directed toward a method of presenting information over a telephone interface “wherein the voice character prosody setting comprises a speech pattern selected from a set of speech patterns, wherein a speech pattern identifies an intonation for presenting said language,” as claimed (emphasis added). Specifically, information is presented in a language using a particular speech pattern. For example, as described in the current specification, callers with speech patterns from a particular region of the country may be presented information in a voice character setting using their speech pattern (page 36, lines 12-15). Furthermore, a voice character setting refers to all aspects of speech pronunciation including speed, volume, pitch, language, voice talent used, actor, characteristics of speech, and/or other prosody values (page 16, lines 21-24).

Applicants respectfully assert that Albal in particular does not teach, disclose, or suggest a method of presenting information over a telephone interface according to a voice character prosody setting comprising a speech pattern identifying intonation for presenting information in a language as claimed. Prosody indicates acoustic characteristics of speech, such as intonation, pitch, frequency, loudness or intensity. In contrast, Albal discloses a

method for presenting information dialog voice personalities and grammars (vocabularies). In particular, Albal does not teach, disclose or suggest presenting information based on a voice character prosody setting, such as intonation, speed, volume and/or other prosody values as described in the present application.

Furthermore, the present invention as claimed recites the limitation of “selecting at least one voice character prosody setting of a language based on the telephone identifying information” (emphasis added). As described in the specification, the telephone identifying information may be used to select a voice character setting based on the locale of the user, or the type of phone a user is calling from (page 36, lines 2-10). In particular, Albal does not teach, disclose or suggest selecting at least one voice character prosody setting of a language based on the telephone identifying information, as claimed. Therefore, Applicants respectfully assert that nowhere does Albal teach, disclose or suggest the present invention as recited in independent Claims 1, 8, 13 and 14, and that these claims are not anticipated by the cited reference.

Claim 3 of the present application recites the limitation wherein “the telephone identifying information is used to identify a locale, the locale associated with a corresponding speech pattern of the set of speech patterns.” Claim 15 recites a similar limitation. Applicants respectfully assert that Albal does not teach, describe or suggest identifying a locale, wherein the locale is

the locale associated with a speech pattern. Therefore, Applicants respectfully assert that nowhere does Albal teach, disclose or suggest the present invention as recited in Claims 3 and 15, and that these claims are not anticipated by the cited reference.

Claim 19 of the present application recites the limitation wherein the “voice character prosody setting further comprises a volume selection for presenting said information at a particular volume level.” Claim 21 recites a similar limitation. Applicants respectfully assert that Albal does not teach, describe or suggest a volume selection. In contrast, Albal is silent as to a volume level for presenting the information. Therefore, Applicants respectfully assert that nowhere does Albal teach, disclose or suggest the present invention as recited in Claims 19 and 21, and that these claims are not anticipated by the cited reference.

Claim 20 of the present application recites the limitation wherein the “voice character prosody setting further comprises a speed selection for presenting said information at a particular speed.” Claim 22 recites a similar limitation. Applicants respectfully assert that Albal does not teach, describe or suggest a speed selection. In contrast, Albal is silent as to a particular speed for presenting the information. Therefore, Applicants respectfully assert that nowhere does Albal teach, disclose or suggest the present invention as recited

in Claims 20 and 22, and that these claims are not anticipated by the cited reference.

Applicants respectfully assert that nowhere does Albal teach, disclose or suggest the present invention as recited in independent Claim 1, 8, 13 and 14 and that these claims are not anticipated by the cited reference. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that Albal also does not teach or suggest the additional claimed features of the present invention as recited in Claims 3-5 and 7 that depend from independent Claim 1, Claims 9-12 that depend from independent Claim 8, and Claims 15-22 that depend from independent Claim 14. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 3-5, 7, 9-12 and 15-22 overcome the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e), and are in condition for allowance as being dependent on an allowable base claim.

CONCLUSION

In light of the above remarks, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the rejected claims. Based on the arguments presented above, Applicants respectfully assert that Claims 1, 3-5 and 7-22 overcome the rejections of record and, therefore, Applicants respectfully solicit allowance of these Claims.


The Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' undersigned representative if the Examiner believes such action would expedite resolution of the present Application.

Please charge our deposit account No. 23-0085 for any unpaid fees.

Respectfully submitted,

WAGNER, MURABITO & HAO L.L.P.

Dated: 21 June, 2004



Matthew J. Blecher
Registration No. 46,558

Two North Market Street
Third Floor
San Jose, CA 95113
(408) 938-9060